

SECTION III—REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed September 4, 2003. Claims 1-12 were canceled in previous amendments, and claims 13, 16, 18 and 19 are amended as shown to more clearly recite features of the claimed invention. Claims 13-21 remain pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the language “einzel focusing lens” in each of these claims lacks antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection. As amended, claim 20 now depends on claim 19, which recites an “einzel focusing lens” and thus provides the necessary antecedent basis. Similarly, claim 21 as amended now depends on claim 20, and thus also has the necessary antecedent basis. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of, and therefore unpatentable over, combinations of U.S. Patent No. 5,394,054 to Chen (“Chen”), U.S. Patent No. 5,990,610 to Matsumoto et al (“Matsumoto”), and prior art allegedly admitted by Applicant. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejections. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. (1) the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations; (2) some suggestion or motivation to combine the references must be found in the prior art; and (3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. MPEP § 2143. As further explained below, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 13, as amended, recites a CRT comprising, among other things, “a second lens between the focus electrode and a continuous internal conductive coating on the neck and the

funnel, wherein the internal conductive coating is connected to anode potential through an anode button in the neck.” Chen and Matsumoto do not, jointly or individually, disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus with these limitations. Chen teaches that the G3 grid 68 is kept at anode potential V_A , the G4 grid 70 is kept at focus potential V_F , and the G5 grid is kept at anode potential V_A . Since focusing relies on differences in potential, after the beam 73 leaves the triode, the beam is focused first between the G3 grid 68 and the G4 grid 70, and again between the G4 grid 70 and the G5 grid 72. The Examiner concedes that in Chen there is indeed no focusing between the grid G5 and the conductive coating, because both are at the same anode potential. Hence, the CRT of Chen cannot be considered a combination including “a second lens between the focus electrode and a continuous internal conductive coating on the neck and the funnel, wherein the internal conductive coating is connected to anode potential through an anode button in the neck.” Matsumoto discloses only a particular way of arranging pins in a connector and makes a suggestion to try the arrangement in a CRT, but it discloses nothing related to how focusing is carried out in an einzel focusing lens, nor how electrodes and grids should be arranged therein. Thus, Chen and Matsumoto taken together cannot disclose, teach or suggest a combination including the limitations in the claim.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 14 and 15 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 13, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicant thus respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

Claim 16 recites a CRT comprising, among other things, “a second lens between the focus electrode and a continuous internal conductive coating on the neck and the funnel, wherein the internal conductive coating is connected to anode potential through an anode button in the neck.” As discussed above in connection with claim 13, none of the references relied upon in this Office Action teaches a combination including this limitation. Moreover, the references, taken alone or in combination, do not suggest this combination. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16 and 18 are in condition for allowance, and requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Regarding claim 17, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 16 is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on allowable claim 16, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of this claim.

Claim 19, as amended, recites an einzel focusing lens comprising, among other things, “a second lens between the focus electrode and a continuous internal conductive coating on the neck and the funnel, wherein the internal conductive coating is connected to anode potential through an anode button in the neck.” As discussed above in connection with claim 13, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner teaches a combination including this limitation. Moreover, the references, taken alone or in combination, do not suggest this combination. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is in condition for allowance, and requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Regarding claims 20 and 21, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 19 is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 20 and 21 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 19, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicant thus respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

Change of Correspondence Address

Applicant’s attorney filed a Change of Correspondence Address for the present

Continued Examination (RCE), the change of address had been noted in the PTO records and correspondence was coming to the current attorney. After the RCE was filed, however, PTO correspondence began going back to the previous attorney. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the proper address into the PTO records so that future correspondence will timely reach the proper attorney.

Conclusion

Overall, none of the references singly or in any motivated combination disclose, teach, or suggest what is recited in the independent claims. Thus, given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all independent claims are now in condition for allowance. The dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly on these independent claims are likewise allowable based on at least the same reasons and based on the recitations contained in each dependent claim.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 292-8600.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9-16-03


Todd M. Becker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,487

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles CA 90025-1030
Phone: 206-292-8600
Facsimile: 206-292-8606

Enclosures: Postcard
Copy of Change of Correspondence Address